



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/028,778

12/28/2001

Hiroaki Tanaka

8004-1013

4276

466 7590 09/23/2008

YOUNG & THOMPSON  
209 Madison Street  
Suite 500  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

ERDEM, FAZLI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2826

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/23/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/028,778	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TANAKA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> FAZLI ERDEM	<b>Art Unit</b> 2826	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 54-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 54-60 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                      |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                          | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 54-56, 58 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe et al. (6,661,476) in view of Shimada et al. (6,448,578) and Fujikawa (6,414,738).

Regarding Claim 54, Abe et al. disclose a liquid crystal display device in Fig 7, having an active matrix substrate having a transparent dielectric plate 1, thin film transistors (TFTs) arranged on the transparent dielectric plate 1, and pixel electrodes 2 arranged on the transparent dielectric plate 1; wherein the active matrix substrate includes scan lines G having a multilevel conductive structure 9/10 (thus meeting the “at least one of scan lines, signal lines, and common lines, each of the lines having a multilevel conductive structure” limitation).

The difference between the claimed device and Abe et al.’s device is that the claimed device requires the multilevel conductive structure to comprise a TiN film having a nitrogen concentration of 25 atomic % or higher, at a respective terminal thereof; the TiN film being located at a top of the multilevel conductive structure; and wherein a transparent conductive film is absent from the TiN film, whereas the scan lines of Abe et al.’s device comprise a multilevel conductive structure having a WSi film located at a top of the multilevel conductive structure.

However, Shimada et al. disclose a thin film transistor and liquid crystal display device where in Fig. 1 multilevel conductive structure scan lines 3c/3b/3a at a respective terminal (part

Art Unit: 2826

3a in Fig. 2) thereof comprises a TiN film 3c; the TiN film 3c being located at a top of the multilevel conductive structure 3c/3b/3a; wherein the TiN film 3c is completely covered by a 400 nm thick silicon nitride insulating film 11 (Fig. 1), so that a transparent conductive film is absent from the TiN film 3c. Furthermore, Fujikawa discloses a semiconductor display device where in Fig. 7 and in column 9, the required nitrogen concentration of higher than 25% is disclosed. In column 9, Fujikawa discloses that as the volume of nitrogen inside the mixing atmosphere increases, the content of nitrogen in TiN increases. Furthermore, also, in column 9, Fujikawa suggests that changing the nitrogen ratio to a different level would produce a different crystal structure of TiN film. Along with Fig. 7, as column 9 suggests, one could arrive at the required 25% or higher nitrogen content/concentration in a TiN film. It is well understood in the art that in most known stable compounds of titanium nitride, the atomic percentage of nitrogen ranges from 37.5% to 55%. Note [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Titanium\\_nitride](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Titanium_nitride), where it is explained that according to published sources (for example L.E. Toth, Transition Metal Carbides and Nitrides (Academic, New York, 1971) stable compounds range in stoichiometry from  $\text{TiN}_{0.6}$  to  $\text{TiN}_{1.2}$ , equivalent to nitrogen atom percentages of 37.5% to 55.4%. Note that the Examiner is not citing this Wikipedia article as an independent authority but simply in response to Applicant's assertion that the prior art fails to teach a "TiN film [which] itself has a nitrogen concentration of 25 atomic % or higher." It is true that neither Fujikawa or Shimada et al. state, in so many words, that the resultant nitrogen atom percentages of their films may range from 37.5% to 55.4%, but given the notorious nature of this fact they can hardly be faulted for failing to make a point of repeating it.

Art Unit: 2826

In the years that have past since the 1971 Toth reference cited in Wikipedia, many patent publications have described titanium nitride films with nitrogen concentrations higher than 25%. Among them are Snyder et al. 3,883,314 (TiN with 22.63 weight percentage, i.e. 49.5 atomic percentage, nitrogen); Snyder 4,591,418 (“[because] the color of TiN varies according the atomic percentage of nitrogen therein, the color of the titanium nitride can be adjusted to approximate the color of a selected gold or gold alloy by adjusting the flow of nitrogen during the deposition [as Fujikawa does].... most colors of commercial interest can be approximated by titanium nitride in which nitrogen comprises 40 to 50 atomic percent”); Case et al. 5,008,217 (titanium nitride containing 45 to 55 atomic percent nitrogen); Sue et al. 5,071,693 (titanium nitride-containing compound having an atomic percent of nitrogen from 33% to 55%); and Sue et al. 5,185,211 (non-stoichiometric titanium nitride coating in which the atomic percent of nitrogen in the titanium nitride is between 32.5% and 47%).

It would have been obvious to one of having ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to include the required multi-layer conductive structure and the required nitrogen concentration in Abe et al. as taught by Shimada et al. in and Fujikawa, respectively, order to have a liquid crystal display device with less film peeling and superior adhesion as disclosed in abstract section of Shimada et al.

Regarding Claim 55, the multilevel conductive structure of Shimada et al.’s Fig. 1 scan line 3a/3b/3c includes Al-based film 3b. Moreover, directly below this layer Shimada et al discloses titanium layer 3a.

Art Unit: 2826

Regarding Claim 56, Shimada et al.'s scan line 4 has the same multilevel conductive structure not only at the respective terminal 4a (figure 2), but also in the remaining parts thereof.

Regarding Claim 58, in Fig. 1, of Shimada et al., titanium nitride layer 4c is located at top, aluminum layer 4b is located in the middle, and titanium layer 4a is located at bottom.

Regarding Claim 60, in Fig. 1 of Shimada et al., middle layer 4b is aluminum.

2. Claim 57 is are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe et al. (6,661,476) in view of Shimada et al. (6,448,578) and Fujikawa (6,414,738), as applied to claim 54, and further in view of Nakamura (6,096,572).

Abe et al., Shimada et al., and Fujikawa suggest a liquid crystal display device having every limitation of claim 57 except the limitation that the multilevel conductive structure is a three-level structure formed by the TiN film located at the top, the Ti film located at the middle, and the Al-based film located at the bottom. The difference between the "invention" of claim 57 is that in claim 57 the Al-based film is on the bottom and the Ti film is in the middle, while in the liquid crystal display device suggested by Abe et al., Shimada et al., and Fujikawa (as well as in the liquid crystal display device of the "invention" of Applicants' claim 58) the positions of the Ti and Al film are the reverse.

In Fig. 8 Nakamura discloses a multi-layer conductive structure configuration of the elements 16/53/54 having aluminum layer in the bottom, titanium in the middle and titanium nitride in the top. It would have been obvious to one of having ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to modify the device suggested by Abe et al., Shimada et al., and Fujikawa to have the aluminum layer in the bottom and the titanium in the middle as suggested

Art Unit: 2826

by Nakamura, order to have a liquid crystal display device with less film peeling and superior adhesion and better conformity to the layer below and above of the multi-layer structure.

3. Claim 59 is are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe et al. (6,661,476) in view of Shimada et al. (6,448,578), and Fujikawa (6,414,738), as applied to claim 54, above, and further in view of Marieb et al. (5,909,635).

Abe et al., Shimada et al., and Fujikawa suggest a liquid crystal display device having every limitation of claim 58 except the requirement that the multilevel conductive structure is a four-level structure formed by inserting a Ti film between the Al-based and TiN films of the three layer multilayer structure claimed in claim 58 (and disclosed by Shimada et al.).

Marieb et al. disclose interconnect structure where in Fig. 1A-1C (and in claims 19-22) the required four-layer multi-level structure (Ti layer 100; Al alloy layer 110; second Ti layer 120; and TiN layer 130) is disclosed.

It would have been obvious to one of having ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to include the required four-layer configuration as taught by Shimada et al. Marieb et al., order to have a liquid crystal display device with less film peeling and superior adhesion and better conformity to the layer below and above of the multi-layer structure.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FAZLI ERDEM whose telephone number is (571)272-1914. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F 8:00 - 5:00.

Art Unit: 2826

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sue Purvis can be reached on (571) 272-1236. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

FE

September 19, 2008

**/Thomas L Dickey/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2826**